

rate educational institution without Mr. Fowler, the college will indeed lose a remarkable educator.

Mr. Speaker, even though Mr. Fowler is set to retire, I know that he will be an active participant in the community for years to come. Again, thank you, Mr. Fowler, for your many years of service.

## BABIES AS MEDICAL PRODUCTS

**HON. HENRY J. HYDE**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 29, 1999*

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, John Kass, a thoughtful columnist for the Chicago Tribune, on June 28, 1999, wrote an important column about a development in modern medicine that has the most serious consequences for the value of human life. I commend Mr. Kass' article to my colleagues:

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 28, 1999]

DRAW THE LINE NOW AGAINST USING BABIES  
AS MEDICAL PRODUCTS  
(By John Kass)

It's an ugly twist on an old science fiction theme:

Would you use the body parts of an innocent baby so that you could live a happier life?

Would you support a system of incentives to kill other babies, and process them like meat at a packing plant, for the benefit of a frightened Baby Boom generation terrified of Alzheimer's disease and death?

Of course not. The suggestion is monstrous and dehumanizing. By comparison, it makes what the Serbs and Albanians are doing to each other look like a gentle game.

But the science fiction scenario doesn't generate the terrifying passions of old Balkan blood feuds.

Instead, it's calculated, without anger, and practiced by reasonable men and women in white lab coats.

It's about pure reason, efficiency and scientific rationalism. It's what a culture can do when it loses its soul. If you don't believe me, ask a Jew about the Nazi concentration camps.

So get horrified. Because it's not science fiction. It's happening now, in our country.

I read about it in Sunday's Tribune, in a fascinating story by science writer Ronald Kotulak under the headline "Stem cells opening path to brain repair."

It began with an anecdote about a woman with Parkinson's disease. Her name is Dr. Jacqueline Winterkorn. The drugs she was taking to fight the disease weren't working anymore.

"It's a very sad disease," Dr. Winterkorn was quoted as saying. "People are locked into bodies that don't move. Their brains are working, their minds are working, but they can't talk and they can't move."

In other words, they're human beings immobilized through no fault of their own, trapped without speech. They have emotions, but they can't do anything about it. They're helpless.

Like a fetus.

But Dr. Winterkorn's condition began improving, the story said, after she was given millions of new brain stem cells because her own brain cells weren't doing their jobs. Her brain cells weren't producing enough dopamine to control her movements.

The new brain stem cells worked just fine. They produced dopamine in her brain. She improved. The scientists are thrilled.

"The prospect of repairing a damaged brain is pretty remarkable," said Dr. Curt Freed, who did the study. "It has been possible to show significant improvements in some patients who suffered from a chronic neurologic disease for an average of 14 years."

But there is a price for Dr. Freed's success. The new brain cells have to come from somewhere. And they don't come from pigs.

They come from fetuses, which is a polite way of saying they come from tiny human beings. The tiny human beings didn't willingly give up their brains. Nobody asked them to sign papers donating their bodies to science.

They didn't have much say in the matter. They were aborted.

The National Institutes of Health—which means the federal government—has lifted its ban on the use of human fetal cells and is bankrolling several other similar studies.

Meanwhile, the White House worries that video games cheapen human life and make possible massacres like the one in Littleton, Colo.

Courts and abortion rights advocates have said that what grows in a mother's womb is not a human being. You don't say baby. That's impolite. You say "it," because that makes a human being easier to kill.

The debate over abortion is an old one now. Most folks have settled into their positions and defend them vigorously. That's not going to change.

What's changing is that we're progressing to a civilized new stage—turning human beings into valuable commodities—in which the bodies of the helpless are used to improve the lives of the powerful.

And it's being done in the name of cold scientific reason. The rhetorical pathway was cleared years ago, when the Germans built Buchenwald and Auschwitz and other places.

Soon other folks with Parkinson's or other brain disorders such as Alzheimer's disease will seek such treatments. The Baby Boom generation that has never been denied will make its demands.

It's human nature to use available resources to satisfy the most powerful human need: staying alive.

So aborted human babies will become resources. They'll become products, subjected to the market. Because they'll have value, there will be an incentive to provide more. Their bodies will be served up for the benefit of adults.

If we don't stop it now, if we accept this crime in the name of scientific reason, we'll lose ourselves.

Ask a mother carrying a child inside her. Ask her if it's not human. Ask any father who puts his hand on his expectant wife's belly and feels a tiny foot.

In a few weeks, they're out and looking up to you. They grab your finger. You kiss their necks. Someday, when they're old enough, they might ask you what fetal brain stem cell research is all about.

What will you tell them?

## THERE THEY GO AGAIN: MORE ON THE CLINTON-GORE SCHEME TO BLACKLIST U.S. JOBS

**HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 29, 1999*

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues the perspective of the Investor's Business Daily newspaper on the Clinton-Gore scheme to blacklist certain

U.S. employers, threaten the jobs of U.S. workers, and increase taxpayers' cost of the government buying goods and services.

DOES RULE "BLACKLIST" BUSINESS?

CONTRACTORS MAY BE PRESUMED GUILTY  
UNDER GORE PLAN

(By John Berlau)

Al Gore's official campaign for president has just begun. But he's already upholding a pledge to organized labor that has business groups fuming.

Gore made his promise when House Minority Leader Richard Gephardt, D-MO—a union favorite—was considering a White House run. In February 1997, Gore told the AFL-CIO Executive Council that "the Clinton administration will seek to bar companies with poor labor records from receiving government contracts."

If a company wants to do business with the Federal Government, Gore said, it has to "respect civil, human and union rights."

Fearing that this promise could become a regulation that favors organized labor, groups like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and the Associated General Contractors of America have been worrying ever since.

Their fears may be justified. The rule is now circulating around federal agencies and lawmakers' offices. It's expected to be published in July.

It would give bureaucrats power to deny government contracts to companies that are merely accused of violating labor, antitrust, health, consumer or environmental laws. The charges don't have to be proved in court; allegations alone may be enough.

The rule could affect the \$180 billion spent on federal contracts with private companies each year. It's estimated that companies doing at least some business with the Federal Government employ more than 25 million people and account for more than a fifth of the work force.

The rule is "much, much worse" than expected, said labor lawyer Hal Coxson, who's executive director of the National Alliance Against Blacklisting, a coalition of business groups opposed to the rule.

"This is huge," said Randy Johnson, vice president for labor and employee benefits at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

But Steven Kelman, head of the White House Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP) from 1993 to 1997, said the rule represents "a common sense point of view: If you violate the law, you can't do business with the Federal Government." Kelman says it's not that different from existing rules contractors must obey.

Gore spokesman Christopher Lehane told National Journal that the vice president "has paid a great deal of attention to (the proposal) because it will help labor in its efforts to continue organizing."

Attempts to get comments from Gore's campaign, his office and OFPP were unsuccessful.

A copy of the regulation obtained by Investor's Business Daily shows how far it could reach.

It says bureaucrats should deny a government contract if there's "persuasive evidence of the prospective contractor's lack of compliance with tax laws, or substantial noncompliance with labor and employment laws, environmental laws, antitrust laws and other consumer protections."

In some cases, violations don't have to be proved. According to the rule, "final adjudication" isn't needed if the contracting officer finds "persuasive evidence of substantial noncompliance with a law or regulation."

A fact sheet White House officials provided to lawmakers gives specific examples of